

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, 1904.

The Remonstrance is published annually by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, California, South Dakota, and other States who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views in the interest of fair discussion.

State Organizations Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Thirty-two Branch Committees; members in 216 cities, towns, and villages.

MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD, President.
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY, Vice-President.
MRS. EHEN S. DRAPER, Presidents.
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer,
Walnut Street, Brookline.
MRS. ROBERT W. LORD, Secretary,
357 Marlboro Street, Boston.

MAINE COMMITTEE.

MRS. CHARLES S. OGDEN, President, Portland.
MRS. SIDNEY W. THAXTER, Secretary, "
MRS. MELVIN P. FRANK, Treasurer, "
MRS. JAMES P. BAXTER, "
MRS. CLARENCE H. CORNING, "
Mrs. F. A. QUINBY, "
MISS LOUISA SPRING, "
MISS CATHERINE P. TALBOT, "
MISS HANNAH L. TALBOT, "
MISS MARY KING LONGFELLOW, "
MISS MARION RICHMOND WEEKS, "
MISS FLORENCE McMULLAN, "
MRS. JOHN M. GLIDDEN, Newcastle.
MRS. P. M. BLAKE, Bangor.

NEW YORK.

MRS. LYMAN ABBOTT, President.
MRS. ARTHUR M. DODGE, 1st Vice-President.
MRS. ELIHU ROOT,
MRS. RICHARD WATSON GILDER,
MRS. WILLIAM PUTNAM,
MRS. PHILIP SCHUYLER VAN PATTEN, Vice Presidents.
MRS. WILLIAM J. WALLACE,
MRS. GEORGE PARKHURST,
MRS. GEORGE WADDINGTON, Treasurer.
MRS. GEORGE PHILLIPS, Secretary,
377 West End Avenue, New York City.

Chairmen of Auxiliaries.

MRS. WILLIAM PUTNAM,
70 Willow Street, Brooklyn.
MRS. PHILIP SCHUYLER VAN PATTEN,
Prospect Avenue, Mt. Vernon.
MRS. W. WINSLOW CRANNELL,
9 Hall Place, Albany.
MRS. GEORGE PARKHURST,
560 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo.

ILLINOIS.

MRS. CAROLINE F. CORBIN, President.
MRS. S. M. NICKERSON,
MRS. R. J. OGLESBY, Vice-Presidents.
MRS. HORATIO N. MAY,
MRS. JAMES B. BARNET, Secretary,
463 Elm Street, Chicago.

OREGON.

MRS. R. W. WILBUR, President.
MRS. W. S. LADD, 1st Vice-President.
MRS. J. B. MONTGOMERY, 2d Vice-President.
MRS. WALLACE McCAMANT, Treasurer.
MISS ELIZABETH M. CARSON, Secretary,
183 20th Street, North, Portland.

IOWA COMMITTEE.

MRS. J. H. MERRILL, 509 W. Fourth Street,
Des Moines.
MRS. MARTIN FLYNN, Des Moines.
MISS EMILY STOWE, Des Moines.
MRS. SIMON CASADY, Des Moines.

RHODE ISLAND COMMITTEE.

Providence.

MRS. WILLIAM ELY, Chairman.

WASHINGTON COMMITTEE.

Seattle.

MRS. JOHN LEARY, President.
MRS. T. B. HARDIN, Vice-President.
MRS. G. W. BACON, Secretary,
512 10th Avenue, South.
MRS. ALFRED DOWNING, Treasurer.

Tacoma.

MRS. CHAUNCEY W. GRIGGS, President.
MRS. FITCH B. STACEY, Vice-President.
MRS. A. B. BULL, Secretary,
108 N. E. Street.

SUFFRAGE DEFEATED IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

In December, 1902, the New Hampshire constitutional convention voted to submit to the voters of the state a suffrage amendment to the constitution of the state in these terms:

Do you approve of striking out the word "male" before the word "inhabitant" in the clause which provides that every male inhabitant twenty-one years of age (with certain exceptions) shall have a right to vote; which clause is supplemented by the provision that every such person shall be considered as an inhabitant for the purpose of electing and being elected to office, as proposed by the amendment to the constitution?

This amendment, with nine others, was submitted March 10, in connection with the annual town meetings and municipal elections. The New Hampshire constitution requires for the ratification of an amendment the favorable vote of two-thirds of the voters voting thereon. Of the ten amendments sub-

mitted three were defeated. Two received a majority vote, but failed of adoption because the affirmative vote did not reach the required two-thirds. The only proposition in the list which failed to receive a majority vote was that for woman suffrage.

The vote for the suffrage amendment was 14,162; the vote against it was 21,788. For ratification the amendment should have received two-thirds of the total vote cast, or 23,967. The affirmative vote fell short of the required number by 9,805.

SUFFRAGE BILLS IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Two suffrage petitions were presented to the Massachusetts legislature last year: one for a bill "To Enable Women Paying Taxes to Vote in Municipal Elections," the other for "A Constitutional Amendment to Strike the Word 'Male' from the Qualifications of Voters."

At the hearing on the first petition before the Committee on Election Laws, the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women appeared in opposition to the petition. The case for the remonstrants was conducted by Mr. Aaron H. Latham; Miss Frances J. Dyer made an address from the working woman's point of view; and letters of protest from a number of tax-paying women were read. The committee reported leave to withdraw, 10 to 1, and the proposition to substitute the bill for the adverse report was voted down in the House without a roll-call.

At the hearing on the second petition before the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, Mr. Latham again conducted the case for the remonstrants; the Rev. Mr. Eells spoke in remonstrance; and delegates from nineteen branches of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women were present and opposed the resolve on behalf of their branches. Letters in remonstrance from many who were unable to come were read. The committee reported leave to withdraw, and the House accepted the report without a roll-call.

In each instance the Senate accepted the adverse report of the committee without debate or a roll-call.

PRESIDENTIAL SUFFRAGE.

IN his report presented at the national suffrage convention at New Orleans last year, Mr. Henry B. Blackwell described the effort to obtain Presidential suffrage for women as "this unique, this providential opportunity." He affirmed that "a majority of any state legislature can at any time confer upon its female citizens an equal right with its male citizens to take part in the appointment of Presidential electors." He contrasted with this possibility the fact that "suffrage in state elections cannot be had without amendments of state constitutions, always difficult and usually impossible of attainment in face of organized opposition."

Mr. Blackwell's unique and providential opportunity seems therefore to resolve itself into this: that, amendment of state constitutions in the interest of woman suffrage being impossible because of the opposition of a majority of the voters of the state, it is possible for a legislature to circumvent the voters and of its own authority give to women the highest form of suffrage.

It may be possible, but it will be a long time before any legislature will be found to take the suggestion seriously.

A DUTY TO KEEP STILL?

LEADERS in the woman suffrage movement profess to think it inconsistent or indecorous that women who are opposed to them should make their views known. Look at these remonstrants, say the suffragists; they pretend to think that the place for women is at home, yet here they are, speaking and organizing in places distant from their homes, and even appearing before legislative committees.

If the reasoning on which this taunt is based were sound, it would follow that the great majority of women ought to keep still, no matter how far their views are misrepresented by the small minority who clamor for the ballot. It is a familiar adage that "Silence gives consent," and in the past the silence of women who did not desire the ballot has been interpreted to mean acquiescence in the demand for the suffrage. The advocates of woman suffrage used to assume to speak for the

sex as a whole, and legislators were often persuaded that they did so.

Women who make their opposition to woman suffrage public do not do so because they crave publicity. It is not pleasure but duty which calls them to appear before legislative committees. They accept a present inconvenience to avert future harm. They believe that it is injurious to women and injurious to the state to have women voting on equal terms with men, engaged with them in the turmoil of politics and sharing with them the responsibilities of government. It is for this reason that they speak their views; and the women who have been active during the last few years in expressing the protest of women against the needless burden of the ballot feel well repaid by the change which has come over public sentiment during that time, and the check that has been imposed upon suffrage legislation.

A DECLINING CAUSE.

THE decline in the suffrage movement in Massachusetts is strikingly shown by a comparison of votes in successive legislatures.

Since the referendum of 1895, when the men voters of the state declared against the expediency of municipal suffrage for women by a majority of 100,000, and less than four per cent. of the women expressed a desire for the municipal ballot, no legislature has taken seriously a municipal suffrage bill. Such measures have either been rejected without a roll-call, or if they have come to a vote have been defeated by an overwhelming majority.

The vote during the last eight years upon proposed constitutional amendments to strike the word "male" from the qualifications of voters is significant. In 1896, 1900 and 1903 the proposed resolves were defeated without roll-calls. In the other years the vote in the House was as follows:

Year	Yeas	Nays	Maj. against
1897	53	86	33
1898	44	97	53
1899	31	82	51
1901	29	132	101
1902	45	137	92

These heavy and increasing majorities against suffrage amendments indicate

that Massachusetts legislatures have accepted, as properly they might, the referendum of 1895 as a mandate against full suffrage for women, as well as against municipal suffrage.

PLEDGING WOMEN'S VOTES.

THE *Woman's Journal* of September 5, 1903, contained an article, signed with the initials of the senior editor, in which it was argued that it was unreasonable ever to expect a general demand of women for the suffrage. Other extensions of the suffrage, the writer remarks, have been made without any active demand on the part of the excluded classes. Poor white men, in 1790, the article proceeds to say, did not clamor for the suffrage, but it was secured in their behalf "by political leaders who wanted their votes for the party that enfranchised them, and have had their loyal support ever since." So, also, negro men in 1867 did not clamor for the ballot. "It was demanded and secured for them by the Republican party as a political necessity, and so long as it has been maintained that party has had the loyal support of the negroes ever since." The article completes the analogy thus:

Some day a great national party will wake up to the fact that by extending equal suffrage to women, it will achieve permanent control of state and nation.

If this means anything, it is a pledge on the part of the *Woman's Journal* that, if women are given the ballot, a majority of them will vote steadily with the party which gave them the suffrage, and will thus give that party "permanent control of state and nation."

If this is true, what becomes of the argument that women, if given the ballot, will vote thoughtfully, intelligently, without passion or caprice, dividing politically, as men divide, after full consideration of measures and policies? Does Mr. Blackwell speak his real conviction when he asserts that the majority of women will go on indefinitely to the end of time, without reference to particular questions of government, voting for the party which gave them the ballot? Or is he merely making a subtle suggestion of a kind of bribe to the political party which may grant what he asks for?

THE PRESS ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

WHY THE BALLOT IS NOT GRANTED.

(From the *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, January 22, 1903.)

THE women of real influence, able concretely to appeal to the spirit of chivalry and self-sacrifice, not only do not wish the suffrage, but appeal to that spirit not to burden them with it. If that appeal were not constantly made by every fireside, not in set terms indeed, but always implied in the attitude of home-keeping women toward their husbands, fathers, brothers and friends, women would long ago have received the suffrage.

The spirit of American men toward women dear to them, and toward womanhood in general, which has, as Miss Gould said, accorded to American women privileges, opportunities and protection such as the women of no other nation enjoy, would add the suffrage to their privileges to-morrow if the women of real influence upon the conduct of men would say but half the word. Such women would not need to ask for it. All they would have to do would be to indicate that they no longer opposed it and that it might, perchance, be profitable or pleasant to them to have it.

A VANISHING ISSUE.

(From the *Sacramento Record-Union*, March 29, 1903.)

One of the proposed amendments to the constitution of New Hampshire recently defeated by a 2 to 1 vote was that granting woman suffrage. The amendment proposed was advanced by a constitutional convention, and was thoroughly debated, and for a long time before the people. So, in the heart of the home of the woman suffrage movement, New England, that scheme has been defeated. It is becoming more and more evident that public sentiment, both East and West, is crystalizing upon the negative of the question, and so rapidly it is not unlikely that within the next ten years the woman suffrage issue will pass out of the scheme of American politics altogether.

MOST WOMEN AS WELL AS MOST MEN OPPOSED.

(From the *New York Times*, March 10, 1903.)

To-day the proposition to incorporate woman suffrage in the Constitution of New Hampshire, already passed by the Constitutional Convention of that state, comes up for the vote of the people at the polls.

It will be submitted, of course, to an exclusively masculine electorate. But we do not believe that any different result would follow from the submission of it to an exclusively feminine electorate. In the cases in which woman suffrage has been adopted by American communities, the argument that has secured the adoption of it has mainly been that in the community in question, being a frontier community, males unduly preponderated, and that the adoption of the measure would tend to attract female immigration. We are not aware that, in any instance, any notable influx of women has

followed the adoption of this supposed inducement. And we rather imagine that the present governor of New Hampshire expressed the sentiments of the majority of his constituency, of either sex, when he said, in his address to the Granges of the state:

We should remember that participation of woman in public affairs always tends to draw her interest away from her most sacred duty, that of home-making. . . . When woman wants the ballot, no honest, intelligent man will withhold it from her. The lack of interest among women in securing the ballot is not so much from failure to recognize its value as from a true appreciation of their present exalted position in the homes of the nation.

A WEARY QUESTION.

(From the *Hartford Courant*, April 7, 1903.)

There is to be a hearing this afternoon on the weary question of female suffrage. The pamphlet circulated this year in its behalf is thirty years old, and the suffrage is farther off than ever. The people do not want it—neither the men nor the women. The recent constitutional convention had the subject before it a year ago, and gave the "reform against nature" six votes out of 168.

This year the demand is an impossible one. It is to make a special class of the tax-paying women and give them the suffrage, denying it to other women. Among men we have no property qualification, and it would be absurd to establish it among women. Another project is to exempt the property of all women from taxation. Put that through, and a good many women would find themselves property-holders. This is as impossible as the other.

The fact is that the people do not want female suffrage. They have ceased to take a facetious view of it, and no longer smile at the idea of one house passing the measure out of chivalry, for the other to reject it out of regard for the public interest in general and the interest of womankind in particular. They want it dropped. When the opportunity was opened for women to vote in school matters it amounted to nothing at the start, and it has been diminishing ever since.

A DEAD ISSUE IN THE WEST.

(From the *Spokane Spokesman-Review*, March 21, 1903.)

The woman suffragists, who have been in convention at New Orleans, showed a good deal of their old-time enthusiasm, although there appear to be no strong reasons why they should be filled with boundless hopes. The people of New Hampshire have just defeated the woman suffrage program, and at the other end of the continent Arizona has refused to admit the political equality of the sexes. To the casual observer it would seem that the suffrage cause is losing rather than gaining ground.

The states enjoying woman suffrage are Colorado, Utah, Idaho and Wyoming. Curiously, the men in all of these states outnumber the women. In Colorado there are 50,000 more; in Idaho 25,000 more; in Wyoming 24,000 more;

while in Utah, owing to its peculiar institution, the men outnumber the women by only 6,000.

It is in the newer communities that the people seem to have been willing to try the innovation, and in states that are noticeably "man" states. In New Hampshire, where equal suffrage has just been defeated, the women outnumber the men by at least 1,000; while in Massachusetts, which has 70,000 more women than men, there is a strong anti-suffrage society made up of women.

It would seem, therefore, that the suffragists would have to look to the West for greater recognition of their rights, and even in this part of the country there are few signs that can give much comfort. Washington tried equal suffrage seventeen years ago, but, judged by popular expression since that time, it had enough of it. There is now in the West no woman suffrage movement that is taken seriously, and, according to all outward manifestations, it is a dead issue.

A PRO-MORMON SUFFRAGE BILL IN ARIZONA.

(From the *New York Mail and Express*, March 18, 1903.)

The Senate has done more than one thing well of late. That one of these things was the blocking of the statehood project for Arizona is proved by the action of the Legislature of that territory in passing the pro-Mormon woman suffrage bill that has been before it.

Woman suffrage in Arizona means two votes, on an average, for every Mormon of voting age in the territory, for, as a rule, every Mormon who is twenty-one years old has at least one wife, and no Mormon woman ever votes against the wishes of the "priesthood"—of which potent body every male Mormon in good standing is a member.

AT A STANDSTILL.

To judge from the results of last year's activities, the woman's suffrage movement in the United States is at a standstill. The legislatures of most of the states were in session, and in a large proportion of them suffrage measures of one kind or another were introduced; but in every instance where such a proposition was voted on, it was defeated. Not a single gain was made anywhere for the suffrage cause. As usual, among the legislatures taking unfavorable action on suffrage propositions, that of Kansas was included. It has never yet been explained by the advocates of woman suffrage how it happens that, if the giving of the full municipal ballot to women in Kansas has worked well, every effort to give women further suffrage privileges in that state, whether made in the legislature or at the polls, has failed.

TAX-PAYING SUFFRAGE.

WHEN the proposition to confer the suffrage upon tax-paying women was first introduced in the Massachusetts legislature, it was supported by an individual and unofficial petition; and Mr. Blackwell, who addressed the committee in behalf of it, was at pains to explain that he did not appear in an official capacity, as representing the Massachusetts Suffrage Association. Since that time the attitude of the suffragists has changed, and the proposition, in Massachusetts and other states, has had the official support of the suffrage associations. This is interesting, because it definitely commits the suffrage leaders to a measure which proposes to base the grant of suffrage to women not on character or intelligence, but on the mere ownership of property, thereby discriminating against the vast majority of women in favor of a very few.

This essentially undemocratic proposition has found no favor with the legislatures. Last year tax-paying suffrage bills were defeated in the legislatures of Massachusetts, Maine, Connecticut, New York, Illinois and Wisconsin.

WOMEN IN COLORADO.

To the *Outlook* for November 28, 1903, Miss Elizabeth McCracken contributed an account of her personal observations of the workings of woman suffrage in Colorado. Admitting that the period of ten years, during which Colorado women have had the ballot, is too brief to give a conclusive answer as to the effect upon public affairs, she remarks that ten years mean a great deal in the life of a woman. Asking what the ballot has done to woman in Colorado, she found it unmistakably apparent, during her visit to the state, that "the majority of those women in Colorado who are actively engaged in politics have hurt themselves with the ballot, and hurt themselves very cruelly."

Miss McCracken found that public life in Colorado had become hysterical, and that women had helped to make it so. The simplest discussion of trivial matters is marked by a breathless tenseness out of all proportion to the occa-

RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

IN 1901.

In Alabama, the constitutional convention rejected a proposition to admit women to the franchise in municipal elections called for the purpose of issuing bonds or incurring debt. Proposed constitutional amendments conferring suffrage upon women were defeated in the legislatures of California, Indiana, Oregon, South Dakota and Wisconsin. In Kansas, a presidential suffrage bill was defeated, and in New Mexico a school suffrage bill, and in Connecticut and Massachusetts municipal suffrage bills were defeated.

IN 1902.

In Kentucky, the legislature repealed the law which had allowed women to vote for school officers in second class cities. In Connecticut the constitutional convention rejected a resolution giving women the full right of suffrage. In Massachusetts, tax-paying and license suffrage bills and a resolve for a suffrage constitutional amendment were defeated. In New York, a bill to give women in third-class cities the right to vote upon tax propositions failed, and the legislature passed a bill repealing the law of 1892, which gave women in towns the right to vote for school commissioners, on the ground that it was unconstitutional. In Vermont, the legislature rejected presidential suffrage and municipal suffrage bills, and refused to admit women to the vote on the local option referendum.

IN 1903.

In Arizona, a bill conferring full suffrage upon women passed both branches of the legislature, but was vetoed by the governor on constitutional grounds. The bill was quite generally regarded as a Mormon measure, and if it had been adopted would unquestionably have heavily increased the Mormon vote.

In Connecticut, a tax-paying suffrage bill was defeated in the House, May 6, 1903 to 60.

In Illinois, bills were introduced to give women tax-payers the right to vote for tax officials and on tax matters and to give all women the right to vote for all officers over whose election the legislature has full control, including Presidential electors; and a joint resolution for a suffrage constitutional amendment. None of these measures was favorably acted on.

In Kansas, a Presidential suffrage bill was defeated.

In Maine, a bill was introduced to confer municipal suffrage upon tax-paying women. The committee on Legal Affairs declined to report it in that form, and eliminated the tax-paying feature. In a new draft, conferring municipal suffrage upon all women, it was discussed in the House February 13, and defeated by a large majority. The senate, a week later, defeated the bill by a tie vote, the president of the senate breaking the tie by voting in the negative.

In Massachusetts, a tax-paying suffrage bill and a proposed constitutional amendment were defeated in the legislature.

In Minnesota, a Presidential suffrage bill was introduced and failed.

In Montana, a resolution for the submission to the people of the suffrage question was killed in the senate by the casting vote of the lieutenant-governor.

In Nebraska, the movement for a constitutional amendment was abandoned, and the suffragists concentrated their efforts upon a bill to improve the property rights of women, which was defeated by hostile amendments, which forced its withdrawal.

In New Hampshire, at the polls, March 10, a constitutional amendment giving women full suffrage was defeated. To carry, the amendment should have received two-thirds of the vote cast. It fell far short of getting even a majority. The vote in favor was 14,162, against 21,788.

In New York, the bill to give all tax-paying women in third-class cities the right to vote on propositions submitted at special tax elections, which was defeated in 1902, again failed. It was passed by the House but failed in the Senate committee.

In Rhode Island, a Presidential suffrage bill was introduced, but failed to receive even a committee report.

In West Virginia, a Presidential suffrage bill was defeated.

In Wisconsin, a tax-paying suffrage bill was rejected.

sion. Philanthropies are carried on by women, not from disinterested motives, but to get votes. When Miss McCracken mentioned a charge of this sort against an active political woman, to one of her friends, to her astonishment the reply was: "Certainly. The people she helps will of course vote for her. For whom else should they vote? She has been kind to them. It is for their own good to give her their support." When Miss McCracken objected that this seemed a little like buying votes with kindness, her companion replied, as if this settled it: "Well, she must have votes. You wouldn't have her buy them with money, would you?"

Here is another instance in point:

One day when I was calling upon a family living in the tenement district, to whom the woman who did charity

work for the mere sake of doing it had shown herself more than once a true friend, I said to the mother of the family, "Your friend is very good to you, isn't she?"

"Yes," agreed the mother. "I don't jest see why she is, though," she added, in a puzzled tone of voice; "she ain't runnin' fur no office."

From these and similar incidents and observations Miss McCracken reaches this conclusion:

However suffrage may be regarded as an abstract problem, it is not to be denied that in Colorado its use by women has, whatever else it may have done or failed to do, brought grave disaster upon those women. The possession of the ballot, and the employment of that possession, have hurt the women of Colorado as women can least afford to be hurt. Her ideals have been lowered; the delicacy of her perception of right and wrong has been dulled.